

QUESTION MODULE DESIGN TEAM (ESS ROUND 4) APPLICATION FORM	
Please return this form by email to:	Mary Keane ess@city.ac.uk (PDF files only)
CLOSING DATE FOR APPLICATIONS: 15:00 hours (CET) on 23rd February 2007	

1. Principal Applicant (person to whom all correspondence will be sent):

Forename: Dominic	Surname: Abrams
Position: Professor, Director of the Centre for the Study of Group Processes	
Department: Psychology	
Institution: University of Kent, UK	
Full Address: Centre for the Study of Group Processes Department of Psychology University of Kent Canterbury Kent CT2 7NP UK	
Tel No: + 441227827475	Email: D.Abrams@kent.ac.uk

2. Co-Applicants (up to 4):

(i) Forename: Luisa	Surname: Lima
Department: Dept of Social and Organizational Psychology	
Institution: Instituto Superior de Ciências do Trabalho e da Empresa, University of Lisbon	
Country: Portugal	Email: luisa.lima@iscte.pt

(ii) Forename: Geneviève	Surname: Coudin
Department: Laboratoire de Psychologie Sociale	
Institution: Université Paris5	
Country: France	Email: genevieve.coudin@univ-paris5.fr

(iii) Forename:	Surname:
Department:	
Institution:	
Country:	Email:

(iv) Forename:	Surname:
Department:	
Institution:	
Country:	Email:

3. Proposed title of module (*max 80 characters*):

Experiences and Expressions of Ageism

4. Abstract (*max 200 words*)

Europe has a steadily ageing population, but the age ratios differ markedly between different European countries. This poses a major challenge both for people's personal and working lives and for public policy. This module is based on items designed and implemented in two major national surveys conducted in the UK (2004, 2006). The surveys used theory and research methods from social psychology to examine several key components of ageism: age stereotypes, attitudes towards ageing, intergenerational contact, intergenerational attitudes, and experiences of ageism. The surveys demonstrated reliable and important findings but only in the context of the UK. The most important finding was that age discrimination is more commonly experienced (by young and old alike) than any other form of prejudice, by a very substantial margin. Yet ageism has never been the subject of a comprehensive cross-national study. Different EU countries are introducing age-discrimination legislation at different rates and this provides an ideal opportunity to examine how different policy contexts, as well as cultural contexts, bear on the management of age-related demographic changes. The proposed module, with a team from the UK, Portugal and France will provide the first major European study of aging related perceptions, relationships and stereotypes.

5. Curriculum vitae

(Please provide a brief cv for each applicant, including subject expertise, questionnaire design and analysis experience, relevant publications and record of joint working – maximum half page per applicant.)

Principal Applicant:

Dominic Abrams, PhD University of Kent 1984.

Present position: Professor of Social Psychology since 1993, Director Centre for the Study of Group Processes since 1996. The Centre was recognised as a 5* research group at the last UK Research Assessment Exercise and includes the UK's largest team of social psychologists (www.kent.ac.uk/psychology/department/research-groups/csdp). He has extensive experience of research on prejudice and discrimination and has published numerous books and articles on social identity and intergroup relations.

Examples of Relevant Publications

Abrams, D., & Emler, N.P. (1992). Self-denial as a paradox of political and regional social identity: Findings from the ESRC's "16-19 Initiative". *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 22, 279-295.; Abrams, D., Hogg, M.A., & Marques, J.M. (Eds.) (2005). *The Social Psychology of Exclusion and Inclusion*. New York: Psychology Press; How Ageist is Britain? (2005). *Age Concern England Report to the Commission on Equality and Human Rights*. (London: Age Concern England, 184_0705 CEHR, 20 pages). www.ageconcern.org.uk/AgeConcern/Documents/how_ageist_is_britain.pdf; Sopp, L., & Abrams, D. (2005). Building critical insight and benchmarks on age discrimination and prejudice: A multi-partnership case study. (30 pages). Shortlisted for the Market Research Society Public Policy/ Social Research Effectiveness Award.; Abrams, D. (2006). The social psychology of neighbourliness. In T. Pilch (Ed.) 'Neighbourliness'. (pp. 24-36). London: The Smith Institute. <http://www.smith-institute.org.uk/pdfs/neighbourliness.pdf>; Ray, S., Sharp, E., & Abrams, D. (2006). Age discrimination: A benchmark of public attitudes. London: Age Concern England (67 pages). http://www.ageconcern.org.uk/AgeConcern/Documents/Ageism_Report.pdf.; Abrams, D., & Houston, D.M. (2006) A Profile of Prejudice in Britain: Report of the National Survey. The Equalities Review. Cabinet Office. (108 pages). <http://www.theequalitiesreview.org.uk>; Abrams, D., Eller, A., & Bryant, J. (2006). An age apart: The effects of intergenerational contact and stereotype threat on performance and intergroup bias. *Psychology and Aging*, 21, 691-702.; Glick, P., Fiske, S.T., Abrams, D. et al, (in press 2006). Competent but arrogant: Perceptions of the United States across 11 nations. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, 28 (4); Abrams, D., Rutland, A., Cameron, L., & Ferrell, J. (2007). Older but wiler: Ingroup accountability and the development of judgments of groups and their members. *Developmental Psychology*, 43, 134-148.

Significant roles.

Chief editor of *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations* (Sage Publications, now vol 10), currently also on editorial boards of 3 international journals.

Chair of British Psychological Society Research Board (2003-6), Chair of UK Joint Committee for Psychology in Higher Education (2006-8), Secretary of European Association of Experimental Social Psychology (2000-2003), Fellow of Society for Psychological Study of Social Issues, and Society of Personality and Social Psychology (Divisions 8 and 9 of the American Psychological Association).

Extensive international collaborative research, including with the International Graduate College (Jena, Louvain la Neuve), University of Porto, University of Amsterdam.

Director of ESRC AIDS Initiative and ESRC 16-19 Initiative longitudinal surveys. Director of ESRC research projects on prejudice and group dynamics. Led the design and analysis of the major national surveys of prejudice for Age Concern England and the Equalities Review (2004-6).

Curriculum vitae (continued):

Co-applicant 1:

Maria Luisa Soares Almeida Pedroso de Lima

Place and date of birth: Ovar, 16 October 1959

Nationality: Portuguese

Highest Degree: 1994 - Ph.D. in Social and Organizational Psychology by ISCTE, Lisboa

Present position: Associate professor at ISCTE since 2000

Professor Lima has published numerous articles and papers on the psychology of aging. She serves on the boards of several significant journals and international research agencies, and has experience both as a coordinator on the ESS Well Being module and in the ISSP.

Examples of Relevant Publications:

Lima, M.L., & Castro, P. (2005). Cultural Theory meets the community: Worldviews and local issues. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 25, 23-35.

Bernardes, S., & Lima, M.L. (2006). Age differences in control beliefs regarding Health: measuring control, strategy and capacity with a newly developed instrument. *British Journal of Health Psychology*, 11(3), 357-371.

Marques, S., Lima, M.L. & Novo, R. (2006). The implicit effects of aging stereotypes and old age identification on older people's medical decisions. *Psychology and Health*, Vol1, Supplement 1, p.96.

Lima, M.L., & Novo, R. (2006). So far, so good? Subjective and social well-being in Portugal and in Europe. *Portuguese Journal of Social Sciences*, 5(1), 5-33.

Marques, S., Lima, M.L. & Novo, R. (2006). Traços estereotípicos associados às pessoas jovens e idosas na cultura portuguesa. [Stereotypical traits of young and older persons in the portuguese culture]. *Laboratório de Psicologia*, 4, 91-108.

Marques, S., Lima, M.L. & Novo, R. (2007). The effects of subtle activation of aging stereotypes on older individual's will-to-live: the role of age identification. (Working Paper No. 03/07). Lisboa: Centro de Investigação e Intervenção Social.

Marques, S., Lima, M.L. & Novo, R. (submitted, under review). Subtle activation of aging stereotypes and older individual's will-to-live: the role of age identification.

Coordination and Collaboration in Recent National and International Projects:

Impactos dos acidentes de trabalho: suas valências ao nível social, organizacional e individual, [Impacts of work accidents: social, organizational and individual dimensions], FCT funded project (2004-2006) PIQS/PSI/50070/2003.

Gripe Pneumónica em Portugal: Gestão de Risco e Saúde Pública no Portugal da Primeira República [The Spanish Flu in Portugal: Risk Management and Public Health], FCT funded project (2005-2007) POCTI/HCT/60718/2004.

ISSP (International Social Survey Programme 1999-2002) Portuguese Scientific coordinator of the Environment Module in the 2000 Survey (project coordinated in Portugal by J. Vala and M. V. Cabral, Instituto de Ciências Sociais, University of Lisbon) .

ESS (European Social Survey 2003-2007) Portuguese Coordinator of the Well Being Module (project coordinated in Portugal by J. Vala, Instituto de Ciências Sociais, University of Lisbon) .

Other Roles

Head of Department (1998-9, 2003-5)

Member of American Psychological Association, European Association of Experimental Social Psychology, and other professional societies, including member of the Directive Board of CIS/ISCTE (1991-7)

Member of 4 journal editorial boards

Organiser of 7 major international meetings

Supervisor of numerous PhDs.

Curriculum vitae (continued):

Co-applicant 2:

Name: Geneviève Coudin

Nationality: French

Highest qualification: PhD Psychology, University Paris5 (Rene Descartes), 1980.

Current position: Lecturer, Psychologie, University Paris5

Dr Coudin's work embraces both quantitative and qualitative approaches and she brings to the team both her expertise in social representations and in the psychology of caring. A former Fullbright scholar at Berkeley, she is experienced in research management and has given numerous national presentations and published numerous articles, including a significant book in this field (2002, below).

Relevant Publications

Coudin, G. & Gely-Nargeot, MC. (2003). Le paradoxe de l'aide aux aidants ou la réticence des aidants à recourir aux services. *Neurologie-Psychiatrie-Gériatrie*, 3 (13), 19-23.

Coudin, G. (2004). La réticence des aidants familiaux face aux services gérontologiques. *Psychologie, Neuropsychiatrie, Vieillesse*, Vol 2(4), 285 –296.

Coudin, G. (2004). L'aide aux familles. In J. GAUCHER, G. RIBES & T. DARNAUD (Eds.). *Alzheimer, l'aide aux aidants. Une nécessaire question d'éthique*. *Chronique sociale*,

Coudin, G (2005). Les familles des malades atteints de maladie d'Alzheimer et leur réticence par rapport à l'aide professionnelle. *Sciences Sociales et Santé*, vol 23,3, 96-104.

Gely-Nargeot, M.C. Coudin, G. & Pousset, H.. (2006). De l'autre côté du miroir de l'aide aux aidants, In B.Michel (Ed.) *Image et démente* (pp. 75-90). Marseille : Solal.

Coudin, G. & Paicheler G. (2002). *Santé et Vieillesse. Perspective psychosociale*. Paris : A.Colin, Coll. Cursus.

Management of Research Projects

Coudin G. (with Gely-Nargeot, M-C., & Krauth-Gruber, S.) *Decoding emotions in old people*

1997-1998. Research supported by Fondation Recherche et Partage (Caisse d'Epargne Ecureuil).

Coudin, G. *Experiencing skin ageing*. 2001-2002. Research supported by CERIES (Centre de recherches et d'investigations épidermiques et sensorielles). Responsable des aspects psychologiques de l'étude

Coudin, G. *Toward an explanation of family caregivers' reluctance towards professional help*

2003-2004. Research supported by Fondation Médéric Alzheimer.

International Invited Research Presentations

Goudin, G (1996). *Elderly people and emotions*. University of Rome La Sapienza, Dipartimento dello Sviluppo e della Socializzazione

Coudin, G (2003). *Adjustment to ageing*, University of Trieste, Dipartimento di Psicologia,

Coudin, G (2004a). *Subjective and objective health in elderly people*. University of Trieste, Dipartimento di Psicologia,

Coudin, G (2004b). *Social comparison : a basic strategy for successful aging*. University of Padova, Department of Psychology

Coudin, G (2005). *Taking time seriously*. University of Milano, Dipartimento di Psicologia,

Coudin, G (2006). *Effects of aging stereotypes on old people*. University of Lisboa, ICSTE

Other Information

Primary teaching responsibilities for University Paris5 Masters in Psychology and European Masters in Gerontology - Psycho-social aspects of ageing and old age (1996-present)

Other professional experience includes Maître de conférences, Psychologie, University Paris5 and Lille3

Curriculum vitae (continued)

Co-applicant 3 (*if applicable*):

Curriculum vitae (continued)

Co-applicant 4 (*if applicable*):

6. Theory behind proposed module (*max 5000 words*):

(A description of the theory that is driving the proposal, demonstrating the team's expertise in the chosen topic (citing relevant literature, past studies, and publications in the field). Explain the relevance of the topic to a key academic or policy concern within the European arena). A list of the variables to be measured should be specified. Full details on the requirements for this section are contained in 'Procedures for appointment and guidelines for applications of ESS question module design teams'.

THIS BOX WILL EXPAND AS YOU ADD TEXT.

AGEING EUROPE

The Council of Europe's most recent report states that, "one of the most outstanding features of Europe's demography is population ageing... Europe is by far the oldest world region... which...poses major challenges to society"[1: p.13] . Europe's median age (37.7) compares with a world median 26.4 but this masks substantial differences between countries. Turkey, Iceland Ireland, Norway and Cyprus all have relatively high proportions of young people (e.g. $\geq 20\%$), whereas the Ukraine, the Czech Republic, Greece, Spain, Italy, Slovenia are substantially lower (all around 15%). Italy, with over 19% of its population aged over 65 contrasts with Iceland, Ireland ($<13\%$), and Turkey (6%).

The 'dependency ratio' encapsulates pressure on the potential working population from the needs of people under 15 and from those over 65. Sweden, France and Belgium have high dependency ratios ($>52\%$) due to large proportions of older people, the similar dependency ratios in Turkey and Iceland are due to high proportions of younger people. In contrast the dependency ratios for Ukraine, Poland, Slovenia, the Czech Republic are substantially lower at between 40% and 45%.

There is also dramatic variation in the ratio of age extremes to each other. The ratio of 65+ year olds to 0-14 year olds ranges from 1.35: 1 in Italy but only .53:1 in Ireland and Iceland. Group size ratios that differ by these margins can have quite profound effects on the likely power, influence and level of victimisation that groups experience [2] .

These national variations provide a crucible within which to compare how and why age ratios relate to social attitudes and expectations, and to gain important insights into the likely areas of social cohesion, schism and change. The Age module will extend current knowledge and understanding the forms and correlates of age-related perceptions and attitudes across Europe.

Age Perceptions and Ageism

Age, along with sex and ethnicity serve as primary perceptual bases on which people categorise one another and thus age serves as perceptual indicator of abilities, competence, skills, experience and even health status. Age-based discrimination arises in relation to specific age points, particular age ranges, and also in terms of general category labels such as 'young' or 'old'. Ageism permeates people's reactions to physical appearance, their use of language; imagery in advertising, employment and healthcare practice[3].

POLICY CONTEXT

The 2000 European Equal Treatment Directive [4] outlawed employment-related discrimination on the grounds of age, disability, religion or belief, and sexual orientation. In the UK implementation is under way but progress is slower in many European countries. Even the UK's age discrimination legislation excludes unpaid work and still enables employers to force people to retire at 65. Similarly, despite England's age discrimination standard as part of the 2001 National Service Framework for Older People, there remain 'deep-rooted cultural attitudes to ageing' in local public services that hamper government plans to improve health and social care for older people [5]. Other equality framework provisions are likely to bear on age discrimination through the work of the Commission for Equality and Human Rights [6].

AGE RELATED DECLINE?

What is the real nature of age-related decline? Older people do process information more slowly, which has an impact on their abilities in the workplace [8]. However, age-related changes are twice as likely in those over the age of 85 [9] compared with less elderly people, and this suggests that age related decline is a phenomenon associated with the end of life rather than at a specific age point. Indeed, younger workers are no better overall at their jobs than older workers. Older people's slower learning is often confounded with their lesser educational qualifications and workplace training [10]. Age differences in cognitive performance are counter-balanced by increased capacity in other areas, particularly previous relevant experience [8].

Even in terms of physical health there is something of a 'medical myth' that ageing is synonymous with disease [11]. Decreased physical function is affected by socio economic status, working in hazardous occupations and even living in council housing such that age itself is not necessarily the key determinant [9, 12]. Ageing can also have positive implications for well-being. For example, older adults report more positive emotion in solving every day problems when compared to younger adults [13]. In sum, research has failed to establish a convincing linear link between declining health and capability, and ageing.

AGE RELATED STEREOTYPES

Despite these positive findings, older people view ill health and old age as strongly linked [14, 11] perhaps because they internalise negative stereotypes. Experimental research shows that exposure to negative stereotypes harms older people's physical capability and health, and even slows their walking speed [15]. Internalised negative stereotypes can also cause extra stress responses (such as increased heart rate, blood pressure and skin conductance) when people are asked to complete tasks that are stereotypically challenging to someone of 'their age' [16].

Older people who accept negative images of ageing are also more likely to suffer with health problems and are more likely to attribute their problems to the ageing process and therefore fail to seek necessary medical assistance. Some older people may also minimise their health problems as a deliberate method of denying negative stereotypes [11]. Older people are sometimes reluctant to visit medical professionals, even to the point of rejecting lifesaving treatment, because of perceived ageism in the system [14, 20].

Mental capability and wellbeing are also negatively affected by exposure to stereotypes and experiences of ageism. Negative stereotypes cause decreases in memory performance and more negative views of ageing [16, 17]. One mechanism for this is 'behavioural confirmation'. Exposure to stereotypes and prejudicial attitudes cause a person to behave in a way which confirms these beliefs [19]. For example the use of 'baby talk' (or infantilisation), or being treated as pitiable causes older people to accept the inference that they are no longer independent adults, and then to behave in a passive and dependent manner in social and medical contexts [18,19]. Evidence from the Age Concern and Mental Health Foundation Inquiry into Mental Health and Wellbeing in Later Life found that older people themselves said that the most effective way to improve mental health and wellbeing would be to improve public attitudes to older people and mental health [7].

These are just a few of the available examples to illustrate the potentially profound impacts of age-based perceptions, stereotypes and attitudes. Thus, a very important part of the problem of ageing is actually the problem of ageism.

AIMS FOR THE ESS AGE MODULE

The ESS has never before examined ageism or intergenerational relationships despite the ubiquity of the former and the enormous social and economic significance of the latter. The aims for the module are to rectify this omission and enhance the methodology for measuring prejudice within the ESS as well as to make use of the core measures in the ESS where appropriate.

Many population surveys of prejudice rely on direct and explicit questions about prejudice that effectively ask 'How prejudiced are you?' (e.g. BSAS since 1983 [21]). Current social psychological research knowledge suggests such measures do not reveal the breadth and depth of prejudice in society. People hold different prejudices about different types of group (e.g. a person who is ageist may not be sexist or racist) and people often wish to appear 'unprejudiced' against some groups but not others [22]. Therefore a more sophisticated approach is required to understand any particular domain of prejudice. Our approach to ageism is rooted firmly in well developed research and theory in the social psychology of prejudice and discrimination. This accepts that prejudice can take many forms, including some that are ostensibly 'benevolent' or tolerant [23, 24]. Thus it is necessary to

evaluate different components of prejudice to properly understand how it applies to particular groups.

Introducing the term 'ageism' in 1969, Robert N Butler, the then Director of the National Institute on Aging in the US, defined it as involving prejudicial attitudes towards older persons, old age and the ageing process, along with discriminatory practices and institutional policies that perpetuate stereotypes about older people [3]. While generally accepting this definition we consider 'ageism' to encapsulate unwarranted assumptions about people of any age on the basis of their age alone.

Of all the common grounds for discrimination (ie gender, race, disability or sexuality), age is the least well-researched [10, 25]. One reason for this could be that age is less easy to categorise because we all age gradually throughout life, moving from one age category to another. In any case, most theoretical work on prejudice and discrimination has been developed using gender and race as subjects of study. To understand what the implications of ageism are we need to know exactly the nature of age related stereotypes and why they are applied. For example, stereotypes that older people are not as capable as younger people may lead to the over inclusion of younger and over exclusion of older workers by disregarding their true capabilities. Or within a workplace older workers may be assigned 'easier' tasks, which may perpetuate an image that they are not able to tackle more complex work.

Applying relevant measures and methods in the context of ageism has been one of the key tasks for Age Concern England's collaborative survey work with Dominic Abrams (principal applicant), and these measures are now well established, tried and tested in a UK context [26,27]. The measurement approach also provided a basis for the wider survey conducted on behalf of the DTI/DCLG and Equalities Review (2006) [22]. Thus we are confident both in the conceptual and practical basis of this methodology.

CONSTRUCTS

The constructs to be measured are:

1. Age categorisation and identification
2. Stereotypes and both 'hostile' and 'benevolent' forms of prejudice
3. Intergroup status and threats both real (e.g. economic), and symbolic (e.g. cultural)
4. Perceptions of prejudice and equality
5. Experiences of and responses to discrimination
6. Intergenerational contact
7. Intergenerational categorisation and similarity

Age Categorisation and Identification

One strong set of predictors of prejudice in most intergroup contexts includes the extent to which people categorise themselves as belonging to an ingroup and the extent to which they positively identify with that category (28, 29). Age is a more interesting case than many simple ingroup/outgroup dimensions (e.g. gender or ethnicity) because there are many different possible cut-points for the categories 'old' and 'young'. Given the demographic differences among European countries it will be especially interesting to see whether the subjective definitions of people into these categories also differ.

Ageist stereotypes may applied automatically to the self [16]. Yet self-stereotyping is highly problematic because people restrict their own horizons based on ageist assumptions (e.g. see themselves as 'too young' or 'too old' to pursue particular activities or roles). For this reason, the very act of categorising self and others into different bands and the way people define those bands have a significant implication for people's actions. In our work with ACE we found substantial differences in the definition of 'old' that was applied by people of different ages and sexes. If people do not agree about the categories themselves it is highly likely that age discrimination will arise at least through misunderstanding and misconstrual if not because of hostile attitudes.

Stereotype Content and Hostile and 'Benevolent' Prejudice

There is an extensive literature on stereotypes and prejudice [30]. Recent research shows how apparently positive stereotypes ironically serve to justify the exclusion or oppression of certain groups in society. Fiske's [23] 'Stereotype Content Model' (SCM) sets out the basic elements of all stereotypes [19] and have found that these could be generally classified along the two dimensions of warmth and competence. Groups that were the target of 'envious' and more overtly hostile prejudice were perceived as high in competence but low in warmth. In contrast those that are targets of 'paternalistic prejudice' were perceived as relatively low in competence but high in warmth. These

perceptions were also associated with socio-structural relationships among the groups. High status groups were often perceived as competent but cold (e.g. men and Jews), whereas low status groups were perceived as warm but incompetent. High-status groups may find it beneficial to attribute traits of warmth (but not competence) to low-status groups. These attributions form an important part of the ideologies that justify the social dominance of one group over others. Jost and Banaji [31] referred to these beliefs as “false consciousness” because, while serving to enhance the self-esteem of low-status group members, these beliefs also serve to maintain and justify the system that oppresses them.

The proposed module will use the SCM taxonomic approach to locate and compare a) the stereotypes, b) the emotions associated with the stereotypes, and c) the perceived underlying intergroup relationships involved in stereotypes. Our previous UK research indicates older people do tend to be perceived paternalistically. These perceptions are associated with ‘benevolent’ feelings such as pity and sympathy, that are positive in tone. They have serious implications (e.g. for employment) if identical failures in performance explained in terms of lack of competence in the old but lack of effort among the young. Moreover, prejudice cuts both ways – younger people are judged to be relatively cold, which is likely to result in their being excluded from other activities and opportunities. Understanding the stereotype content applied to different age ranges therefore provides clear insight into the likely differences in opportunity that these groups will be afforded.

Socialisation models of stereotypes assume that cultural norms determine how younger and older people are viewed [30]. Culture defines the status and respect accorded to older versus younger people, the roles that are deemed appropriate for them, and thus the stereotypical expectations applied to them. Because different cultures within Europe may emphasise different values (especially tradition and family) the stereotypes of younger and older people may differ quite widely between countries.

Other perspectives, consider that age-related perceptions should be more dynamic, responding to implications of demographic change, the needs of the employment market and the changing structures of families and personal relationships. Thus we envisage a much more contextually specific basis for variation in stereotype content and ageism, resulting in variations both between and cross-cutting national settings (e.g. assessable through multilevel modelling).

Perceived Status and Threats

Variability in stereotypes seems likely to reflect different power/status and conflict relationships and more immediate contexts in which people live and work. For example, people in ‘young’ occupations (e.g. athletes, police officers) may have a different view of aging than those in extended professional occupations such as law, academia or medicine. Likewise, people may view age related capabilities differently when thinking about employees versus bosses. In addition, intergroup relationships should affect ageism, In particular, where there are conflicts (e.g. over the ‘rights of pensioners’, or dealing with ‘unruly youth’ etc) younger and older people may adopt politically antagonistic perspectives. Economic conflicts (e.g. rehiring older workers versus training younger workers) may also be a basis for resentment and prejudice. Consequently it is important to measure people’s perceptions of intergroup threat and their views regarding principles of equality and justice relating to age differences. These measures will provide an interesting contrast with threat related to other demographic changes such as immigration (measured elsewhere within ESS) because we envisage the relative importance of each will differ in different countries.

The steps from stereotypes to prejudice are complex. Our work is most strongly informed by research based on Social Identity Theory [(SIT)28] showing that people incorporate group memberships into their self-concepts so that comparisons between groups reflect strongly on feelings of self-worth. A central tenet is that the more that people identify with a particular social group the more strongly they are likely to defend its status, value and interests, and the more they will want it to be viewed as more positive and distinctive from contrasting groups. Social identification is a basis for group loyalty but it also underpins intergroup prejudice and discrimination

However SIT holds that prejudice is likely to be expressed in contextually relevant ways. The particular age boundaries people apply (e.g. whether a 45 year old classifies him or her self as ‘young’ or ‘old’) reflect the expression of different identities in different contexts (indeed,. the same person could be prejudiced against both older and younger people but use different dimensions of social comparison to express these prejudices). SIT also theorises how people view themselves depending on the social structural position of their groups (e.g. high or low status, and with options for change or not)

This approach represents a challenge to approaches that assume a more stable pan cultural

segmentation of the lifecourse [32], such as preparation and education, family building and work, and retirement. These reflect institutional, spatial and cultural separation between age groups in society, which prevent intergenerational interaction and lead to negative feelings and/or ignorance between age groups. In turn this leads to the development of stereotypes and prejudice.

To address these theoretical questions we need to measure age categorisation, the key elements of the stereotype content model, perceived intergenerational threats, and social values.

Perceptions of Prejudice and Equality

There is of course a larger complexity in the case of ageism than in the case of other forms of prejudice. First, all people age, and second, our closest relatives are usually both older and younger (parents and children). Arguably then, ageism may fluctuate depending on the nature of these intergenerational relationships, and one's own age. There are both proximal and distal mechanisms for defending the self and these should be exemplified by more direct (e.g. physical avoidance or negative attitudes) and indirect (e.g. categorising older people's 'different') reactions.

The majority of older people maintain a positive sense of wellbeing throughout their later life. This is often referred to as 'successful' or 'optimal' ageing, and may appear to contradict evidence about the likely impacts of negative stereotypes, prejudice and discrimination [15]. Similarly, older people consistently rate their health as good [11]. This positive outlook could be explained in various ways, including narrowing of expectations and horizons, and compartmentalisation of these experiences.

For example, SIT holds that when their group has a subordinate position people respond using a variety of psychological strategies [28]. These include social mobility (shifting allegiance to another group, for example younger people trying to appear older), social creativity (finding new aspects of one's group to celebrate) and social competition (direct efforts to outperform or challenge the dominance of the higher status group, e.g. by collective mobilisation). We believe all of these strategies are likely to be deployed as a function of people's age-based demographic and electoral weight and viewing themselves as having a larger stake and say in their own outcomes. The responses should be reflected in different profiles of attitudes to issues of equality and prejudice (including the respondent's own prejudices) relating to age. Therefore the module will include a set of items examining these issues.

Experiences of Discrimination

In order to put ratings of well being in context it is essential to also record people's experience of prejudice, not just against a group they happen to belong to, but against themselves as a result of their membership of that group. As well as providing essential information about Europe-wide differences in experiences of ageism, this is necessary to provide a clearer comparative context for understanding the nature of the linkage between stereotypes and autostereotypes with prejudice and discrimination. We therefore include a simple and fairly direct measure for this purpose.

Intergenerational Contact

Perhaps the most important basis for age stereotypes and prejudice will be people's specific experiences in relation to others of different ages. The extensive literature on intergroup contact [33] demonstrates that positive experiences of contact between members of different groups can lay the ground for positive attitudes and behaviour. Positive personal relationships, especially friendships, across intergroup boundaries are likely to generalize to more positive attitudes and less stereotyping of the outgroup as a whole.

Related to research on contact is the idea from socioemotional selectivity theory [15] that because of increased psychosocial maturity gained with age, older people are able to successfully control potentially negative experiences. Instead of putting themselves into situations where they could come into contact with strangers (who may hold ageist views and thus react negatively), older people surround themselves with family and friends who will provide positive responses and help maintain the older person's positive emotional state. However, recent research shows that older people with closer intergenerational contacts are less vulnerable to priming effects on their performance. When told their performance on a cognitive test was being compared with that of younger people, older people with less intergenerational contact performed significantly worse than those with more intergenerational contact [34]. Therefore, an important indicator of a group's risk of discrimination or social exclusion is the extent to which its members are in regular positive contact with others. However, little is known about variability in cross-age ties as a function of nation and culture across Europe. Consequently their role in age-related stereotypes and attitudes is not fully understood and needs to be investigated more deeply.

Intergroup Similarity and Intergroup Categorization

There has been considerable effort in the last decade to measure how people categorise people into the same and different groups. A number of techniques have been developed partially based on Gaertner and Dovidio's (2000) 'common ingroup identity model'. [35] Their extensive research shows that prejudice is lowered when people from another group are perceived either purely as individuals or as sharing a common group with oneself rather than as belonging to a distinctive and separate groups. These perceptions also shape the way we might react when we think those people are victims of prejudice. Moreover, it should be the case that positive intergroup contact creates the potential for better understanding of the outgroup and perhaps establishment of a superordinate, or common ingroup, identity, as well as linking a member of the outgroup to the self-concept [36].

To examine the preceding issues we will measure experiences of discrimination, age identification and intergenerational contact.

THE RESEARCH TEAM

The research team is led by Professor Dominic Abrams, Director of the Centre for the Study of Group Processes at the University of Kent. The module is based on well established theory, methods and evidence and the three investigators share a common knowledge of the field and a common theoretical background from social psychology.

Prof Abrams has worked extensively with both Age Concern England and the Equalities Review on three major surveys of prejudice and discrimination [22,26,27]. His research uses experimental and survey methodology to examine theory-based models of prejudice and discrimination across a wide range of groups and across the life span. Moreover, he has the support of an extensive team of co-researchers at the CSGP who have also been involved in designing and testing the previous surveys.

Professor Lima previously collaborated on ESS module on well being (with Vala) and the International Social Survey Programme Environmental module. She brings to this theme expertise from the social psychology of health, focusing on well-being, comparative optimism and risk perception among older citizens.

Dr Geneviève Coudin has focused on the social representations of aging and, more recently, on the study of the older population caregivers. Her work is rooted more broadly in both psychology and social anthropology and thus adds conceptual richness as well as cultural breadth to our proposed module.

Different studies have shown that aging issues are seen very differently within the three countries. For example, recent international studies focusing on the attitudes towards retirement [37] and satisfaction with retirement [38] have found the lowest levels of satisfaction and the highest rates of despair among Portuguese retirees. Given our different national experience and our different expertise on the topic, we anticipate find many interesting relationships with other indicators provided in the basic module of ESS.

In sum, the Ageing Europe module will fit well with the core, both in style and content. It is ideally suited for a comparative rather than country specific survey owing to the ubiquity of ageing as a phenomenon and the different national demographics that affect relationships between age groups. The research will benefit hugely from a population-wide sample precisely because of the need to model where, in different countries, the relevant age boundaries are by which people ascribe ageist perceptions, and to see how different demographic, economic and other variables are related to these perceptions. The research is aimed at all residents and will be suitable across all countries. The module should have very wide intellectual and academic as well as participatory appeal given that the 'demographic time bomb' of a potentially high dependency elderly population is ticking so quickly. The module will add a very important new dimension to the ESS knowledge base, and it will be a dimension that is relevant to the entire population of Europe, one that does not focus only on particular types of minority group, and one that taps into the most pervasive aspects of prejudice. The module will add new methodology that will also broaden the scope and connection of the ESS to other bodies of work within social psychology and social and political science.

REFERENCES

1. Recent Demographic Developments in Europe. Council of Europe Publishing, 2005
2. Leader, T., Mullen, B., & Abrams, D. (in press). Without mercy: the immediate impact of group size on lynch mob atrocity. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*.
3. Wilkinson J and Ferraro K (2002). Thirty Years of Ageism Research. In Nelson T (ed). *Ageism: Stereotyping and Prejudice Against Older Persons*. Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 2002
4. Council Directive 2000/78/EC establishing a general framework for equal treatment in employment and occupation. 27 November 2000.
5. *Living Well in Later Life: A review of progress against the National Service Framework for Older People*. Commission for Healthcare Audit and Inspection, London, March 2006.
6. *The Equalities Review: Interim Report for Consultation*. 2006. Cabinet Office.
7. *Third Sector First (2005). Things to do, places to go: promoting mental health and well-being in later life*.
8. Warr, P. (1999). *Job Performance and the Ageing Workforce*. In Chmiel N (ed). *An Introduction to Work and Organisational Psychology – A European Perspective*. Blackwell.
9. Pasupathi, M. and Löckenhoff, C. (2002), *Ageist behaviour*. In Nelson T (ed) 2002 op cit..
10. Nelson T. (2005) *Ageism: Prejudice against our feared future self*. *Journal of Social Issues*, 2005, 61 (2)
11. Sidell M. (1995) *Health in old age: Myth, mystery and management*. Open University Press.
12. Bowling A. (2005). *Ageing well: Quality of life in old age*. Open University Press.
13. Blanchard-Fields, F., Chen, Y., & Norris, L. (1997). *Everyday problem solving across the adult life span: The influence of domain-specificity and cognitive appraisal*. *Psychology and Aging*, 12, 684-693.
14. Fee L et al. (1999). *Assessing older people's health and social needs*. Health Education Authority.
15. Krauss, L., Whitbourne S, & Sneed J (2002). *The paradox of well-being, identity processes and stereotype threat*. In Nelson T (ed) op cit..
16. Levy, B. & Banaji, M (2002). *Implicit ageism*. In Nelson T (ed) op cit..
17. Hess, T. M., Auman, C., Colcombe, S. J., & Rahhal, T. A. (2003). *The impact of stereotype threat on age differences in memory performance*. *Journal of Gerontology: Psychological Sciences*, 58, 3–11.
18. Montepare, J. & Zebrowitz, L. (2002), *A social-developmental view of ageism*. In Nelson T (ed). Op cit.
19. Cuddy A., Norton, M., & Fiske, S. (2005). *This old stereotype: The pervasiveness and persistence of the elderly stereotype*. *Journal of Social Issues*, 2005, 61 (2).
20. Golub, S., Filipowicz, A., & Langer, E. (2002). *Acting your age*. In Nelson T (ed). Op cit.
21. Rothern, C. & Heath, A. (2003). *Trends in racial prejudice*. In A.Park, J. Curtice, L. Jarvis, & C. Bromley (eds) *British Social Attitudes – continuity and change over two decades*, Sage, London, 2003.
22. Abrams, D., & Houston, D.M. (2006). *Equality, diversity and prejudice in Britain: Report for*

the Cabinet Office Equalities Review. DCLG.

23. Fiske, S.T, Cuddy, J.C., Glick, P. & Xu, J. (2002) A model of (often mixed) stereotype content: Competence and warmth respectively follow from perceived status and competition. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 82, 878-902.
24. Katz, L. & Hass, R.G. (1998) Racial ambivalence and American value conflict: Correlational and priming studies of dual cognitive structures. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 55, 893-905.
25. Carstensen, L.L. & Hartel, C.R. (Eds.) (2006). *When I'm 64*. National Research Council of the National Academies.
26. Age Concern England (2004). *How ageist is Britain?* London: Age Concern England.
27. Ray, S., Sharp, E., & Abrams, D. (2006). *Age discrimination 2006: A benchmark for public attitudes*. Age Concern England, Policy Unit.
28. Abrams, D. and Hogg, M.A. (2001) Collective identity: Group membership and self-conception. In M.A. Hogg and S. Tindale (Eds) *Blackwell handbook of social psychology*, vol 3: Group processes. (pp. 425-461). Oxford: Blackwell.
29. Tajfel, H. (1981) *Human groups and social categories*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
30. Schneider, D.J. (2004). *The psychology of stereotyping*. New York: Guildford Press.
31. Jost, J.T., & Banaji, M.R. (1994) The role of stereotyping in system justification and the production of false consciousness. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 22, 1-27.
32. Hagestad O., & Uhlenburg, P. (2005). The social separation of old and young: a root of ageism. *Journal of Social Issues*, 2005, 61 (2).
33. Pettigrew, T F. (1998). Intergroup contact theory. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 47, 65-85.
34. Abrams, D., Eller, A. & Bryant, J. (2006). An age apart: The effects of intergenerational contact and stereotype threat on performance and intergroup bias. *Psychology and Aging*, 21, 691-702.
35. Gaerter, S I and Dovidio, J F. (2000). *Reducing intergroup bias: the Common Ingroup Identity Model*. Philadelphia, Psychology Press, 2000.
36. Brown, R. J., & Hewstone, M. (2005). An integrative theory of intergroup contact. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 37, 255–343.
37. AXA (2005). *Retirement: A new life after work? Axa retirement scope*. Retrieved from :http://www.retirement-scope.axa.com/country/download/2005/retirement_scope_en.pdf
38. Fouquereau, E., Fernandez, A., Fonseca, A.M., Paul, M.C., & Uotinen, V. (2005). Perceptions of and satisfaction with retirement: a comparison of six European Union Countries. *Psychology and Aging*, 20, 524-528.

7. Proposed module design (*max 2000 words*):

Outline, in advance of a first draft of actual questions, how the team proposes to operationalise their measurement objectives. This section should succinctly state the theoretical questions to be answered and then propose the method for doing this. Please describe the proposed coverage of each set of measures and indicate the final information requirement. All of the variables to be measured stated in Section 6 should be covered here. In addition please identify any existing indicators that might successfully be deployed cross-nationally). Full details on the requirements for this section are contained in 'Procedures for appointment and guidelines for applications of ESS question module design teams'.

THIS BOX WILL EXPAND AS YOU ADD TEXT.

In this section we speak further to questions of readiness and innovation, and describe the questions to be asked under each heading. The methodology was developed through an extensive programme of work with Age Concern England, starting in 2004, and then elaborated with additional work in 2005 and 6. [26,27].

The conceptual framework is based on the following conclusions from the research literature on prejudice. Our expertise and perspective is based in quantitative social psychology, which emphasizes rigorous measurement and a clear conceptual framework for guiding research questions.

We propose a series of items based on previous research to measure the following areas. We think these can be completed within approximately 50 items (with minima and maxima suggested for each block).

- Age self-categorisation and identification (5-7 items)
- Stereotype content of older and younger people (16-24 x 1/2 items)
- Forms of threat from older and younger people (5 items)
- Status/power acceptance towards older and younger people (2 items)
- Perceptions of prejudice towards older and younger people (3 - 4 items)
- Self-control over prejudice (2 items)
- Egalitarianism and work ethic (3 items)
- Equal opportunities orientation towards older people (1 item)
- Experience of discrimination (1 to 6 items)
- Intergenerational contact (2-4 items)
- Intergenerational similarity and categorization (2 items)

Because age is a continuous variable we have in the past combined two methods of assessing age related responses. First we seek self-determined judgements, for example about the meaning of 'old', or about ageing. Second we provide a structured comparative framework within which people are asked to make explicit comparisons between age categories. Choices about the latter are potentially unlimited, but our detailed pilot work and previous survey work has shown that it is safe to use two boundaries that have reasonably consensual meaning. Thus, when we want to ask separately about younger and older groups these will be specified as people under 30 and people over 70, respectively.

SURVEY ITEMS

Age Categorisation and Age Identification

We already have evidence from within the UK that older and younger people use substantially different boundaries but we do not know whether this is a universal or a nationally specific phenomenon. Therefore, to measure age self-categorization we have opted for a graded approach that will allow people to define both the category they belong to (young, middle, old age), and their position within that category on a multi-interval single item scale. Round 3 included a set of 3 items, split for men and women (rotated module D17/18). These could substitute for our items, providing greater continuity. However, the 4 (non split) items we have used previously also work well and have yielded results that are both meaningful and are related strongly to other variables in sensible ways.

To measure age identification we have used three items based on previous social identity research that ask about strength of identification 'with my age group'. Both a longer and shorter version of this (Likert) scale has been used by ACE surveys, successfully.

We advocate positioning the age categorisation and age identification questions away from the ageism items, thus either earlier or later in the survey.

Stereotype Content and Benevolent Prejudice

The items we propose to use in this study are a minimal set that can be used to assess the core dimensions of stereotype content, adapted from Fiske et al's. [27] research. These have now been used three times in our UK research and yielded consistent results. These will provide a useful benchmark of consensual social perceptions about older people. The items are answered using a grid format whereby the target category is rated on a 5-point scale for each of a series of 12 dimensions central to the model. The items can be reduced but we consider that this grid is relatively fast to answer and the field team have indicated that each item can safely be regarded as a 'half' item or less.

Intergroup Threat

Based on research by Stephan and Stephan [39] on inter-ethnic prejudice we will include 3 items that we have used previously in relation to older people. One examines realistic threat (safety, security, health), one examines symbolic threat (culture), and the third examines economic threat. These are similar in form to the items measuring threats from immigrants in the previous ESS surveys (e.g. B38-40). The original scales were 10-point answering scales: 1 (strongly disagree) to 10 (strongly agree)], and we have previously used a 5 point scale format. Evidence from the UK suggests older people currently pose little realistic or symbolic threat, threat at present, but there is substantial concern about their economic impact, particularly among younger people. Moreover we may find that threat

focused on employment may vary by country as a function of their different age-discrimination legislations. As a means of assessing intergenerational conflict we also propose to include two directly comparative items (using an interval scale) that asks people to nominate the age range that most strongly stands in the way of young people's employment, and of older people's employment.

Work Status/Power Acceptance Towards Younger and Older People

We will include a standard 'social distance' item (e.g. it has appeared often in the BSAS) about how comfortable people would feel with an older boss. This prejudice item focuses particularly on the workplace. We found an equally informative item was a similar question about having a younger person as one's boss. These items allow an age-graded comparison of status attitudes in relation to age. We anticipate national differences in age-based divergence in these attitudes, reflecting young/old ratios in the population.

Perceptions of Prejudice Towards Older People

We considered using BSAS items about current and future prejudice (i.e. compared with 5 years ago and in 5 years time). These were benchmarked in ACE's 2004 survey but we have since concluded that it is difficult to know their meaning. On the other hand we have successfully used items about whether organizations avoid employing older people, and about the image of older people portrayed in the media. These tend to be related to stereotype content judgements and hence probably provide more insight into the national imagery of ageing.

Equal Opportunities Orientation

As a complement to the Values survey we think it important to measure people's commitment to equal opportunities using an item that was also included in the Scottish Social Attitude Survey, tapping whether EO has gone too far or not far enough, but specifying the question in relation to older people. This type of item has also served as a measure of 'subtle' or symbolic prejudice in racism research. We would also accept the more general form of the question as it may be useful for interpreting other evidence from the survey.

Egalitarianism and Work Ethic

These two values are cited by Katz and Hass [24] as especially relevant to modern forms of prejudice. To the extent that one of these values is potentially challenged by a group, people may see that group as a legitimate target for prejudice. For purposes of theory testing, we propose the ESS might include one item for each of these to complement those assessed in the Schwartz values measure, plus one BSA item that taps commitment to redistribution of wealth (political liberalism).

Self-Control Over Prejudice

Plant and Devine [40] developed a 10 item measure of internal and external motivations to control the expression of prejudice (generally used in the context of black-white). In principle this scale provides a useful way of tapping social and personal inhibitions about expressing prejudice. Through our own analyses in a UK (student) sample (N = 439) we reduced this to a two item measure (although 4 or 6 is preferred). We have found, both in our ACE and Equalities Review surveys that the Plant & Devine items are less ambiguous to interpret (and yields different interpretations) than the often used BSAS item about whether people do feel, feel but don't express, or don't feel prejudiced.

Experience of Discrimination

The Eurobarometer survey used a measure of perceptions of prejudice towards different groups. We have adapted this with a more specific time-frame to explore whether people feel they have been the victim of prejudice or discrimination on the basis of different social categories they may belong to. This can provide us with some clearer comparative reference points (e.g. at what age do people start experiencing ageism, as compared with sexism), that we think would be especially useful. The items in the ESS (C24/25) should, we believe, be supplemented by the measure we have already developed to tap personal experience of discrimination. Not only is this measure economical (6 Likert items), we also know that it maps on very well to a more detailed and specific measure that asks about different types and instances of discrimination. Although a single item could be used for ageism alone, we believe these items would be extremely valuable for the ESS as a whole, not just the Age module.

Intergenerational Contact

To assess intergenerational contact the framing of items has been tested extensively by ACE's surveys [26,27, also 34]. It is important to ask about contact with both older and younger people separately. This will allow us to measure (and take account of) social isolation generally (i.e. low contact with both categories) as well as relative isolation (contact with only one category). The previous ESS had a very general pair of item about meeting friends (C2, C3). These do not adequately assess intergenerational contact but the format could be adapted to do so. In addition, the context of contact is very important (e.g. within the work place vs as personal friends). Thus we propose to use the items developed from the ACE and DTI/Equalities Review surveys.

Intergroup Categorization

We propose two items using 5 point scales to measure the perceived distinctiveness versus overlap and the particular type of overlap of younger and older people as social categories. One item will use a verbal measure from Gaertner and Dovidio's work. The other will use a visual scale based on Aron et al's measure of 'Inclusion of Other in the Self'[41] but later adapted for intergroup relations. Both measures have been tried and tested.

RELATION TO CORE MODULES

We have commented above where there are specific connections with other content in ESS. More generally, from the core, the Values survey is a particularly important for evaluating how age-related attitudes and perceptions may relate to different value orientations. We anticipate this may also help to explain national and regional variations. The media and social trust sections should relate meaningfully to our indices of stereotype content and public prejudice. The satisfaction with life, education and health should also relate to age related attitudes to work and equality as well as experiences of contact and prejudice. We are particularly interested in the extent to which age-related threats compare with ethnic threat, and how this will vary nationally. The social inclusion measures in the core survey also should be illuminating in the case of intergenerational contact and perceptions. We expect that people and countries with stronger intergenerational ties may also experience lower levels of social exclusion and less fear. The measures of health and religiosity are also relevant to the way older and younger people may interpret age-related changes and differences.

Additional References for this section.

39. Stephan, W. & Stephan, C.W. (2000) An integrated threat theory of prejudice. In S. Oskamp (Ed.) *Reducing prejudice and discrimination* (pp 23-46). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
40. Plant, EA & Devine, PG (1998). Internal and external motivation to respond without prejudice. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 75, 811-832.
41. Wright, S. C., Aron, A., McLaughlin-Volpe, T., & Ropp, S. A. (1997). The extended contact effect: Knowledge of cross-group friendships and prejudice. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 73, 73-90

